

REMARKS

Claims 1-56 were presented for examination. In an Office Action dated December 31, 2007, claims 1-56 were rejected. Claims 1, 19, 20, 22, and 27-53 are amended herein to more distinctly claim Applicants' invention. In making these amendments, Applicants do not concede that the subject matter of the prior claims was in fact disclosed or taught by the cited prior art. Rather, Applicants reserve the right to pursue such protection at a later point in time in this or another application.

Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above Amendment and following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

Substance of the Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for her time in conducting a telephone interview on April 29, 2008. During the telephone interview, Applicants' attorney and the Examiner discussed the rejection under 35 USC 101 and the rejection under 35 USC 103(b) based on Ryan and Knight. Applicants' attorney and the Examiner agreed that an amendment to the claims 27-52 to recite a "computer-readable storage medium" would overcome the 35 USC 101 rejection. The Examiner also suggested amending the claims to more particularly recite how a user's interaction with an article results in the extraction of keywords that are used in the generation of an implicit query, so as to clarify the distinction between the claimed invention and search engines that operate based on keywords explicitly typed into search engine interfaces. The Applicants have taken the Examiner's suggestions into account while preparing the amendments presented herein.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 101

The Examiner rejected claims 27-52 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended “computer-readable medium” to recite “computer-readable storage medium” as agreed upon in the Examiner Interview discussed above. Accordingly, this rejection is now moot.

Response to Rejections Under 35 USC 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 10-32, 36-52 and 54-56 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ryan et al. (“Ryan”) U.S. Patent No. 6,421,675, in view of Knight et al. (“Knight”) U.S. Patent No. 6,571,234. This rejection is traversed.

Claim 1 as amended recites (1) “receiving an event concerning the user’s current context, wherein the event comprises a user interaction with an article having content stored on a local client device...;” (2) “analyzing the content of the article associated with the event concerning the user’s current context to extract at least one keyword;” and (3) “generating an implicit query based at least in part on the at least one keyword.” These three features of the claimed invention are beneficial because the result set will comprise article identifiers relevant to the user at that particular time without the user having to explicitly enter a search query.

Ryan does not teach or suggest at least features (1), (2) and (3) of claim 1 mentioned above. With respect to feature (1), Ryan does not disclose or suggest “a user interaction with an article having content stored on a local client device.” Ryan discloses a user’s explicit keyword entry into an interface of the search engine to generate a result set. (See, e.g., col. 4,

ln. 49-51.) The Examiner suggests on page 4 of the Office Action dated December 31, 2007, that the search interface corresponds to the claimed “article.” However, the search interface does not have content stored on a local client device. Thus, Ryan does not disclose or suggest “a user interaction with an article having content stored on a local client device” as recited in claim 1.

With respect to feature (2), Ryan also does not disclose or suggest “analyzing the content of the article associated with the event concerning the user’s current context to extract at least one keyword.” Ryan discloses a search engine having keyword suggestion functionality (see Fig. 1A). The keyword suggestion functionality is based on a keyword entered by the user into an interface of the search engine. (See, e.g., col. 4, ln. 43-54). At best, Ryan teaches analyzing the keyword entered into the search engine interface to generate additional keywords. Ryan does not teach analyzing the content of the article to extract at least one keyword.

With respect to feature (3), as the Examiner acknowledges, Ryan does not teach or suggest “generating an implicit query based at least in part on the at least one keyword.” Ryan discloses a user’s explicit keyword entry into an interface of the search engine to generate a result set. (See, e.g., col. 4, ln. 49-51.) Therefore, Ryan also does not disclose feature (3) of claim 1 discussed above.

Knight does not remedy the deficiencies of Ryan with respect to at least features (1) and (2) of claim 1 discussed above. With respect to feature (1), Knight does not disclose or suggest “a user interaction with an article having content stored on a local client device.” Knight discloses methods and systems of managing an online message board. Subscriber queries and postings are made to an online message board (see abstract) through a user query

interface 530 or a user posting interface 535 (See Fig. 5). Knight does not disclose or suggest that a subscriber interacts with an article having content stored on the subscriber's local client device. Thus, Knight does not disclose or suggest feature (1) of claim 1.

With respect to feature (2), Knight does not disclose or suggest "analyzing the content of article associated with the event concerning the user's current context to extract at least one keyword." Knight discloses the use of data filters that are formulated manually by operators associated with the service provider. Col. 19, ln. 45-47. In these cases, the keywords have already been extracted, and there is no analysis of the content of an article associated with an event concerning the user's current context described. Alternatively, subscriber queries are analyzed for keywords to determine subject matter of general interest to the community (col. 19, ln. 62- col. 20, ln. 4) which can be indexed and used by an operator as a "hot topic" list for the manual formulation of a new data filter or as an input to an automatic community based query (col. 20, ln. 19-27). Knight does not disclose or suggest analyzing the content of an article associated with an event concerning the user's current context.

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

Claims 22, 27, and 48 recite similar features as those discussed above with respect to claim 1. All arguments with respect to claim 1 apply equally to claims 22, 27, and 48. In addition, claims 2-6, 10-21, 23-26, 28-32, 36-47, 49-52, and 54-56 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, 22, 27, or 48. Therefore, Applicants submit that these claims are

patentable, both for the reasons given above by reason of their dependency, and for the further features recited therein.

The Examiner rejected claims 7-9, 33-35, and 53 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ryan, in view of Knight, in further view of Pub. No. US2004/0059730 to Ming Zhou (“Zhou”). This rejection is traversed.

Claims 7-9 and 33-35 depend from claims 1 or 27, respectively. Applicants have described above that Ryan and Knight do not disclose or suggest at least the claimed features of (1) “receiving an event concerning the user’s current context, wherein the event comprises a user interaction with an article having content stored on a local client device...;” and (2) “analyzing the content of the article associated with the event concerning the user’s current context to extract at least one keyword.” Zhou does not remedy the deficiencies of Ryan and Knight. Zhou describes a system for use in machine-aided writing in non-native languages. (See paragraph 2.) The system can provide sentences in response to a user’s query. (See paragraph 11.) Zhou discloses a user inputs a query (see, e.g., Figs. 3, 5-2, 6-3, paragraph 42), which is used to generate suggested sentence structures or expanded expressions from an associated database. As such, Zhou does not disclose features (1) or (2) as claimed.

Thus, Applicants submit that claims 7-9 and 33-35 are patentable over Ryan, Knight, and Zhou, alone or in the combinations suggested by the Examiner, by reason of their dependency and the further features recited therein.

Claim 53 recites a method comprising “receiving a contextual event concerning the user’s current context, the event comprising a user’s modification of a file having content stored on a local client device;” and “analyzing the content of the file stored on the local client device to extract at least one keyword.”

Ryan does not disclose or suggest “a user’s modification of a file having content stored on a local client device” nor “analyzing the content of the file stored on the local client device to extract at least one keyword.” As discussed above, Ryan discloses a search engine having keyword suggestion functionality (see Fig. 1A). The keyword suggestion functionality is based on a keyword entered by the user into an interface of the search engine (see, e.g., col. 4, ln. 43-54), which is not a user modification of a file having content stored on the local client device. Moreover, as discussed above, at best, Ryan teaches analyzing the keyword entered into the search engine interface to generate additional keywords. Ryan does not teach analyzing the content of the file stored on the local client device to extract a keyword.

Knight also does not disclose or suggest “a user’s modification of a file having content stored on a local client device” nor “analyzing the content of the file stored on the local client device to extract at least one keyword.” Knight discloses the management of an online message board for subscribers, but does not disclose a subscriber’s modification of any files stored on respective local client devices. (See, e.g., title, abstract.) Thus, Knight also does not disclose or suggest analyzing any file stored on a local client device to extract a keyword.

Zhou also does not disclose or suggest “a user’s modification of a file having content stored on a local client device” nor “analyzing the content of the file stored on the local client device to extract at least one keyword.” In Zhou, the user inputs a query (see, e.g., Figs. 3, 5-2, 6-3, paragraph 42) from which the query terms are taken. Zhou does not disclose or suggest a user’s modification of a file having content stored on the local client device nor

analyzing the content of the file stored on the local client device to extract at least one keyword.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 53 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now pending are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons given above, while not necessarily conceding any contention not specifically addressed. Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections of these claims and request allowance of them.

If the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicants' attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Niniane Wang et al.

Date: April 30, 2008

By: /Robin W. Reasoner/

Robin W. Reasoner, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 58,257
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7172
Fax: (650) 938-5200
Email: rreasoner@fenwick.com